

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al.
 Serial No.: 10/815,764
 Filed: April 2, 2004
 Final Office Action Mailing Date: December 23, 2008

Examiner: Navneet K. AHLUWALIA
 Group Art Unit: 2166
 Attorney Docket: 27655

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62 have been rejected. Claims 1, 27, 28 and 49 have been amended herewith. Claim 26 has been cancelled herewith. Claims 41-48 and 60 have been cancelled in a previous communication.

The Application now comprises, after amendments, claims 1-25, 27-40, 49-59, 61 and 62, of which claims 1 and 49 are in independent form.

Interview

The Examiner is thanked for the Interview kindly granted on May 27, 2009 which helped the Applicants considerably in understanding the Examiner's requirements. Claim 1 was discussed in some detail and the Examiner pointed out certain clarity issues which have now been addressed by the present amendments.

It is believed that the amendments to the clarity issues render the citations moot but the citations are nevertheless addressed for completeness.

Amendments to Address the Clarity Issues Raised in the Interview

Claim 1 is amended to clarify that there is a first relatively fast comparison, where the "relatively fast" is in relation to the second, relatively slower textual comparison.

Claim 1 is further amended to specify that when the second match is also positive then a distribution policy is applied to the information sequence.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Zuk et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0154399 A1), referred herein after as 'Zuk', in light of Singh (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0068526 A1).

The claim rejections are respectfully traversed.

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al.
Serial No.: 10/815,764
Filed: April 2, 2004
Final Office Action Mailing Date: December 23, 2008

Examiner: Navneet K. AHLUWALIA
Group Art Unit: 2166
Attorney Docket: 27655

Claim 1 specifies that both the predetermined information items whose distribution it is desired to control and the information sequence it is desired to scan, are changed into a format that facilitates a first relatively *fast comparison*. This first, relatively fast comparison may be applied to the passing traffic, the information sequences, in general. Then, when the fast comparison signals a match, a second relatively slow *detailed textual comparison* is made to confirm the findings of the fast comparison. If the match is confirmed by the detailed comparison then it is concluded that the material it is desired to control is actually present in the information sequence and distribution is then subjected to any relevant distribution policy.

The claim defines the above features as follows:

determining the presence of one or more of said prestored information items within said transformed information sequence, said determining comprising:

comparing said information sequence with said information item in said format facilitating said first relatively fast comparison; and

if a match is found between said formats facilitating fast comparison then carrying out said second relatively slow textual comparison between said respective prestored information item and said extracted information sequence.

It is clear from the above that the claim makes a specific requirement for a fast comparison based on the first format – the "format facilitating said first relatively fast comparison".

It is clear that the claim defines a second stage, of relatively slow textual comparison. The fast and slow in the claim are defined relative to each other, and thus the claim provides an internally consistent definition system.

The Examiner cites against this claim the paragraphs 24 and 25 of Zuk.

Paragraphs 24 and 25 of Zuk teach about firewalls and intrusion detection systems (IDS). The passage states in general that an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) may be used to "collect information *from a variety of system and network resources* to analyze the information for signs of intrusion".

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al.
Serial No.: 10/815,764
Filed: April 2, 2004
Final Office Action Mailing Date: December 23, 2008

Examiner: Navneet K. AHLUWALIA
Group Art Unit: 2166
Attorney Docket: 27655

However, the passage does not teach that the comparison is:

determining the presence of one or more of said prestored information items within said transformed information sequence, said determining comprising:

comparing said information sequence with said information item in said format facilitating said first relatively fast comparison; and

if a match is found between said formats facilitating fast comparison then carrying out a second relatively slow textual comparison between said respective prestored information item and said extracted information sequence.

In order to make a case against the claim the Examiner has to find *the actual features claimed* or prove that they are *obvious*. The teaching of *collecting information from a variety of sources*, does not anticipate or render obvious *comparing said information sequence with said information items in said format facilitating said first relatively fast comparison*, especially when that is followed by a second relatively slow textual comparison..

That is to say Zuk does *not* teach *two-stage* searching at relatively different speeds, certainly not where the first search is fast relative to the second textual search.

Regardless of the above, he does not control distribution of predetermined information items based on such a search. He simply protects an internal environment from a harmful exterior via a firewall.

Thus even if Singh were to be combined with Zuk, there is still a failure to teach *two stage* searching. Singh does not carry out two-stage searching and Zuk does not carry out comparison at all, much less two stage searching.

Even if Singh were combined with Zuk, the second stage of the search is not taught since Singh does not carry out a *textual* comparison, as defined in the claim. Zuk does not carry out either a rapid search comparison *or* a textual comparison, and indeed carrying out a textual comparison would not be relevant to Zuk, who is merely checking for protocol anomalies that might indicate an attack.

In looking for harmful packets, exact text comparison is useless. So such a text comparison is not taught either by Zuk, or by Singh, nor would it be obvious to the skilled person reading the combination.

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al.
 Serial No.: 10/815,764
 Filed: April 2, 2004
 Final Office Action Mailing Date: December 23, 2008

Examiner: Navneet K. AHLUWALIA
 Group Art Unit: 2166
 Attorney Docket: 27655

In summary Zuk paragraph 24-25 does *not* teach a *textual comparison* as claimed, *or* a canonical form comparison. Singh *only* teaches canonical form. Thus *no-one* teaches a textual comparison *at all*.

Even if they did teach a textual comparison, neither Singh nor Zuk teach a *two-stage* comparison.

Even if they did teach a two stage comparison, they do not teach a two stage comparison where the first stage is a fast comparison relative to the second stage which is a textual comparison.

Thus the skilled person would *not* know that the textual comparison should be made the *second* stage in a *two stage* search.

Neither does the skilled person learn that the canonical form comparison should be made the *first stage* in a *two-stage* comparison.

Indeed he does *not* learn that a textual stage is required *at all*, since a textual stage cannot be inferred from paragraph 24 or 25 of Zuk, which merely teaches searching through resources in the most general sense. Thus the skilled person is unable to infer that there should be a *two-stage* comparison in the first place.

The Examiner argues, page two last two lines, "Furthermore, nowhere in claim 1 is there support for the argument of information being compared". However claim 1 explicitly defines a first stage of comparing the information sequence with the prestored information items based on the format for rapid searching, and a second stage of a textual comparison.

Irrespective of the above, the Examiner claims to have found the claimed feature of "transforming said information sequence obtained from said digital medium into said format facilitating fast comparison in accordance with said transformation format" in paragraph 10 of Zuk. However, paragraph 10 refers to *spoofing* of IP addresses. It merely teaches translating of source addresses to *different* source addresses, that is to say *without* any transformation format. It is well known to the skilled person that there is only a *single format* for IP addresses. Hence Zuk paragraph 10 does not teach a *transformation format*, contrary to the claimed feature. That is to say this claimed feature requires a transformation carried out in accordance with a transformation format. Spoofing of addresses is just a straightforward translation and there *is no transformation format* either taught or hinted at in Zuk.

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al.
 Serial No.: 10/815,764
 Filed: April 2, 2004
 Final Office Action Mailing Date: December 23, 2008

Examiner: Navneet K. AHLUWALIA
 Group Art Unit: 2166
 Attorney Docket: 27655

Furthermore contrary to the requirement of the claim, the whole point of address spoofing in paragraph 10 is that the information (of the original address) *is lost*, whereas the claim requires that information *is that used in the later two-stage searching*. That is to say the information translation of paragraph 10 of Zuk would fail to support the later stages of the claim where comparison is carried out, since in Zuk the information has been lost, making searching meaningless.

The above arguments are believed to apply mutatis mutandis to claim 49, to which the same amendments have been made. Claim 49 is thus now believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

The dependent claims are believed to be allowable as being dependent on allowable main claims.

All of the matters raised by the Examiner have been dealt with and are believed to have been overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are allowable. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan
 Registration No. 40,338

Date: June 23, 2009

Enclosures:

- Request for Continued Examination (RCE); and
- Petition for Extension of Time (3 Months)